

Lasionota Warren, 1912 would then be valid again. Its replacement name *Isatoolna* Nye, 1975 seemed to have been in common use since its proposal, and the authors had not evaluated the consequences of changing back to *Lasionota* Warren. Bouchet, voting AGAINST, pointed out that *Lasionota* Mannerheim, 1837 could qualify as a nomen oblitum, but the application gave references to only three authors that had used *Dactylozodes* in the last 50 years: Gardner (1989), Moore (1997) and the author of the application Bellamy (1998, 2003, 2006). This was not sufficient, in his view, to protect *Dactylozodes*, and thus he voted in favour of Priority. Halliday said he voted AGAINST the proposal for two reasons. First, no evidence was presented to show whether or not *Lasionota* and *Dactylozodes* were synonymous, except for Lacordaire (1857). The most we could do under these circumstances was to rule that *Dactylozodes* had precedence over *Lasionota* when these names were considered as synonyms, not unconditional suppression of *Lasionota*. Second, the evidence for prevailing usage of *Dactylozodes* was very thin. Apart from papers written by the authors of the present proposal, there were only a handful of usages of *Dactylozodes*. Adherence to the Principle of Priority would not result in any disruption to nomenclature. Pape, voting AGAINST, commented that this was a case relating to the ‘fuzzy’ concept of prevailing usage. He said that the Code had very explicit requirements for reversal of precedence, and when these were not fulfilled there should be very good reasons, i.e. something that went beyond prevailing usage, for a ruling. He did not feel these were presented in the Case and so voted against. Similarly, Rosenberg voted AGAINST with the comment that, according to the application, *Lasionota* had not be used as valid since 1857, but only seven uses of *Dactylozodes* since 1899 were cited, none of them outside the field of systematic entomology. He felt that there was no compelling reason not to follow priority in this case. He pointed out that even if the application was declined by the Commission, if *Dactylozodes* was more widely used than the application suggested, the author could give precedence to *Dactylozodes* under Article 23.9, if enough uses of the name as valid could be found.

No names are placed on Official Lists or Indexes in this ruling and the issue is left open for subsequent workers to follow the precepts of the Code or to make new proposals to the Commission.

Corrigendum to Opinion 2218 (Case 3403)

***Mecistocephalus* Newport, 1843 and *Pachymerium* Koch, 1847 (Chilopoda): current usage conserved by designation of *Mecistocephalus punctifrons* Newport, 1843 as the type species of *Mecistocephalus* Newport, 1843 (BZN 66: 93–94)**

Ruling (2)(a) in Opinion 2218 is to be read as follows:

- (b) *Pachymerium* Koch, 1847 (gender: neuter), type species *Geophilus ferrugineus* Koch, 1835, by monotypy.

Erratum

The correct number for the Opinion on Case 3405 *Trigonostomum* Schmidt, 1852 (Platyhelminthes, TRIGONOSTOMIDAE) and *Trigonostomus* Brenske, 1893 (Coleoptera, SCARABAEIDAE): generic names conserved is 2229.

This has been corrected on the hardcopy and on the PDF before distribution.